

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

008/010

OCT 04 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Lin Cheng**

Examiner: **Hanh Van Tran**

Serial No.: **09/934,549**

Group Art Unit: **3637**

Filed: **08/23/2001**

Confirmation No.: **9167**

For: **RETICLE BOX TRANSPORT CART**

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence (and anything referred to as being transmitted herewith) is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. 571-273-8300) on the date shown below.

Date: October 4, 2007


Maria E. Provencio

Examiner Hanh Van Tran
Mail Stop RCE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
5 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**COMMUNICATION TO EXAMINER REGARDING EXAMINER INTERVIEW OF
OCTOBER 3, 2007**

Commissioner:

Applicants take this opportunity to thank Examiner Tran for discussing the
10 claimed invention and the proposed claim amendments filed in the July 27, 2007
Response to Office action, in a telephonic Examiner Interview between Applicants'
undersigned representative, Mark J. Marcelli and Examiner Tran, that took place on
October 3, 2007.

During the aforementioned Examiner Interview, Mr. Marcelli and Examiner Tran
15 discussed the claim amendments and remarks provided in the previously-filed July 27,
2007 Response. The following comments are provided pursuant to Examiner Tran's
recommendation to highlight aspects of the remarks filed in the July 27, 2007
Response.

In particular, the Armentrout (USP 6,421,113) reference was discussed. The reticle carrier in Armentrout is a reticle library cassette 200 that is contained within a SMIF (standard mechanical interface) pod 100 and one of ordinary skill in the art recognizes that a SMIF pod is carried around using a handle such as shown in Fig. 9 of Armentrout, or using automated transport systems. Fig. 9 also shows that the SMIF pod is sized to closely surround one horizontally positioned reticle and to accommodate only a limited number (6, in the illustrated embodiment) of tightly stacked reticles. As such, and as known by one of ordinary skill in the semiconductor art, a SMIF pod is not wheeled around on the ground. As such, one in possession of Armentrout would not look to modify the SMIF by providing wheels or other attributes for bulk delivery systems such as provided in the identified references such as in Weiss, Person-Guided Vehicle, or Hopkins, which provides an Airline Baggage Cart.

Moreover, it was discussed that the SMIF pod indeed includes an *interface* as the name implies, and in the case of Armentrout, the interface is at the bottom where the SMIF pod interfaces with the processing equipment upon which it is received. Since the SMIF pod is received within the underlying equipment and includes an o-ring at/near the interface to prevent contamination, one would have not add wheels to the bottom of the Armentrout reticle carrier as the wheels would likely interfere with the interface between the SMIF pod and the station receiving it.

Applicants' undersigned representative also pointed out to Examiner Tran that the claimed configuration of the shock absorbers is distinguished from feature 76 of the Hopkins reference, which was relied upon for providing a shock absorber. The claimed shock absorbers are mounted on a second surface of a platform with wheels being attached to the opposed first surface of the platform. The shock absorbers are disposed above the platform and between the platform and an overlying upper portion. Pads 76 of Hopkins are distinguished because they are disposed on one side of angle bracket 79 and wheels are not disposed on an opposed surface of angle bracket 79, as required by the claim language. The wheels are laterally spaced from the angle bracket 79 and attached to a completely different member.

In view of the amendments filed in the July 27, 2007 Response, the Remarks/Arguments furnished therein, and the interview with Examiner Tran,

Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-8 is in allowable form and the application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully and expeditiously requested.

5 The Assistant Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary to give effect to this filing or credit any excess payment that may be associated with this communication to deposit account 04-1679.

Respectfully submitted,

10

Dated: 04 October 2007


Mark J. Marcelli, Reg. No. 36,593
Attorney for Applicant

15 DUANE MORRIS LLP
101 West Broadway, Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 744-2200
Facsimile: (619) 744-2201